

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited via the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents; P.O. Box 1450; Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on October 23, 2003.

Theodore P. Cummings	40-193
Name of Attorney	Registration No.
Signature of Attorney	



*Cummings  
11-423727  
11/Election*

Case 8330M

## IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In the Application of :  
 Gerard Laurent Buisson, et al. : Conf. No. 6598  
 Serial No.: 10/008,583 : Group Art Unit: 3727  
 Filed: November 13, 2001 : Examiner: Robin Annette Hylton  
 Title: STRUCTURES FOR PROVIDING A REMOVABLE CLOSURE

### RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT

Honorable Commissioner for Patents  
 P.O. Box 1450  
 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

**RECEIVED**

OCT 31 2003

TECHNOLOGY CENTER R3700

Dear Sir:

This is in response to the Office Action dated September 23, 2003 in the above-identified patent application, which sets forth a 1-month period for response. No fees are believed to be due.

### REMARKS

#### A. Restriction Requirement

In the Action, the Examiner asserts that the claims are drawn to patentably distinct inventions. In this regard, the Examiner has issued a restriction requirement, requiring election between the following two groups:

Group I: Claims 27-34, drawn to a container, classified in class 220; subclass 657; and

Group II: Claims 1-26, drawn to a membrane lid, classified in class 220, subclass 359.2.

Applicants hereby traverse the restriction requirement made by the Examiner and provisionally elect Group I. Applicants reserve the right to file a petition from the requirement for restriction pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.144.

Claims 27-35 are believed to read upon provisionally elected Group I.

#### B. Election of Species Requirement

The Examiner states that the inventions of Group I and Group II are related as subcombinations disclosed as usable together in a single combination. The Examiner further states that the subcombinations are distinct from each other if they are shown to be separately usable and that the "invention of Group II has separate utility such as a lid for a container not requiring the sides of the container lip to be structurally differently than the corner portions of the